



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/697,810

10/30/2003

Warren E. Baxley

199-0248US-C

9575

29855

7590

10/05/2009

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI,
L.L.P.

20333 SH 249 6th Floor
HOUSTON, TX 77070

EXAMINER

PASIA, REDENTOR M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2416

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/05/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/697,810	Applicant(s) BAXLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner REDENTOR M. PASIA	Art Unit 2416	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-10, 12-15 and 32-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 and 32-39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5, 7-10 and 12-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Specie 2 of Figure 4 and claims 3-5, 7-10, 12-15 in the reply filed on 06/05/2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that two criteria have to be met, for example, (i) Examiner must provide "the reasons (as distinguished from the mere statement of conclusion) why each invention as claimed is either independent or distinct from the other(s)," and (ii) Examiner must provide "reasons why there would be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required".

This is not found persuasive because it is noted that the most recent restriction requirement was made in the form of an Election of Species and not a Restriction requirement between more than one invention.

Moreover, in response to argument (i), the Examiner did provide reasons needed for an invention to be either independent or distinct as explicitly shown in Par. 1 of Election requirement (05/11/2009) as shown below:

- *Specie 1 of Figure 3 is directed to an audio conferencing method of FIG. 2 in which an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) server is not used.*
- *Specie 2 of Figure 4 is directed to an audio conferencing method of FIG. 2 in which an IVR server is used.*
- *Specie 3 of Figure 5 is directed to a dial-out method of the present invention.*

The Examiner provided explicit reasons and not mere statement of conclusion as shown above.

Art Unit: 2416

In response to argument (ii), the Examiner has shown explicit evidence of several patentably distinct embodiments of the method of the present application as shown in the above citation (i.e. Specie 1 of Figure 3, Specie 2 of Figure 4 and Specie 3 of Figure 5). It should be noted that the mere evidence of several patentably distinct embodiments is a prima facie evidence of examining burden of the Examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

Response to Arguments

- Objection to the Claims

Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's Remarks, page 8, filed 01/29/2009), with respect to objection of claim 7 (minor informalities) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Claim 7 was amended to include the missing word. The objection of claim 7 has been withdrawn.

- Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's Remarks page 8-10 regarding rejections of claims 7, 3 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 7, Applicant's Attorney argues that Detample et al. (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detample) is directed to circuit switched networks, while on the other hand, the instant claims are directed to packet-switched networks (see page 9, 3rd ¶).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., packet switched networks) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted

Art Unit: 2416

in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

It should be further noted that claim 7 recites the claim limitation "purely packet-switched audio conferencing system." However, it is also noted that a "purely packet-switched audio conferencing system" can exist in a non-purely packet-switched network (emphasis). Given the broadest reasonable interpretation for a system, the Examiner can elect certain components in a non-purely packet switched network and these certain components which handle packet switching further forms a system (i.e. packet-switched audio conferencing system). The Examiner has pointed out different components of the system of Detample in Figures 1 and 4 which performs packet-switching functions. It should also be further noted that the components, Service Switching Points (SSP) 402 in Figure 4 still performs packet-switching since SSP 402 utilizes SS7 signaling protocol to handle request handling (see col. 8, lines 14-25). Though, implemented in a circuit-switched network (i.e. PSTN), SSP 402 are considered as a packet-switching component.

In this regard, given the rejection and along with the additional reasoning presented above, Detample shows the above-mentioned claim limitation.

Also regarding claim 7, Applicant's Attorney further argues that Detample does not show the claim limitation "initiate a call request" and "establishing a point-to-point call *from* said multipoint *to* said additional endpoint" (see page 9, 4th ¶).

However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's Attorney and asserts that Detample shows that above-mentioned claim limitation.

Art Unit: 2416

Specifically, Applicant's Attorney also has stated that claim 7 can be seen as "allowing a conference participant to initiate an **outbound** call to an additional endpoint (i.e., another phone number) via the MCU and thereby add the new endpoint to the audio conference. Detample connects **inbound** calls to an available bridge server."

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., allowing a conference participant to initiate an **outbound** call) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Moreover, Examiner will still address the argument in relation having an **outbound call** in the present claims and the **inbound call** as shown by Detample. Regarding the claim limitation, "initiate a call request" which the Applicant's Attorney relates to the outbound call.

Even though the claim language presented in claim 7 shows "initiating a call request from said selected multipoint control unit", it is not specific enough where the "call request" originate from since the multipoint control unit does not have knowledge by itself to actually call the additional endpoint. Thus, it has been seen by the Examiner that the claimed "call request" is actually in response to a call being placed by another endpoint. Examiner also assumes that this view is also shared by the Applicant's Attorney since Applicant's Attorney has stated "claim 7 allows for a conference participant to initiate an **outbound call**..." The initiated call request can be seen as: (1) being based on an outgoing call initiated by a conference participant in an on-going/active conference or (2) being based on inbound call initiated by another endpoint not

Art Unit: 2416

currently participating in the conference. However, since claim language only shows "initiating a call request" and **not** "initiating a call request...based on an **outgoing call...**", the Examiner has elected interpretation (2) which is inline with the audio conferencing system of Detample.

Additionally (see col. 10, line 38+), in establishing a call in the conference system, Detample initially shows the upon verification of the user, the selected bridge server (i.e. claimed multipoint control unit) sends a conference start packet (i.e. call request) via BAPI module 303, Bridge Manager module 310 to the Operator Interface module 305.. Modules 303, 310 and 305 are part of Conference Allocation and Control System (CACS) 301 (i.e. claimed packet switched conferencing system component).

In this regard, given the rejection and along with the additional reasoning presented above, Detample shows the above-mentioned claim limitation.

As to claims 3 and 12, Applicant's Attorney has presented arguments based on the arguments already presented in claim 7. Thus, the Examiner has applied the same reasoning to the above-mentioned claims.

- Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

As to claims 4-5, 8-10, 13-15, Applicant's Attorney has presented arguments based on the arguments already presented in claim 7. Thus, the Examiner has applied the same reasoning to the above-mentioned claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 3, 7, and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel).

As to claim 7, Detampel shows a method for adding an additional endpoint to an audio conference in a purely packet-switched audio conferencing system (Figure 1; abstract; method for setting up an on-demand conference call in a telecommunications system), said method comprising:

placing a call from an endpoint (figure 6, step 601, caller dials) to a packet-switched conferencing system component (Figure 3, CACS 301),

said call indicating an audio conference (Figure 6, step 601; col. 9, lines 61-62, caller dials a unique on-demand conference number);

selecting, in a conference allocation and control system (Figure 1, CACS 103; Figure 3, CACS 301) in said audio conferencing system (figure 1, system 10), a multiple control unit (Figure 1; one of bridge servers 101a-101n) to host said audio conference (col. 5, lines 36-38, when an on-demand conference call request comes in, the CACS determines which bridge servers 101 have sufficient availability of ports to handle the on-demand conference call; col. 9,

Art Unit: 2416

lines 61-66; the steps take place as described above to select the bridge server 101 having enough ports available for the subscriber's maximum call);

initiating a call request from said selected multiple control unit (Figure 1, bridge 101a-n) to said packet-switched conferencing system component (Figure 3, Bridge Manager 310 in CACS 301), said call request indicating said additional endpoint (col. 10, lines 52-67; as each participant joins the conference, a participant join message is sent via BAPI module 303 and the bridge manager 310 (BAPI module 303 and bridge manager 310 are part of CACS).);

returning a destination address (col. 8, line 33; ONNET translation number) from said packet-switched conferencing system component to said selected multiple control unit (col. 8, lines 14-55; The CACS call router module 302 receives a routing request from over network 109 from the SCP pair 105. The CACS 103 selects a bridge server 101 with enough available capacity to handle the maximum number of conference participants allowed by the service (e.g., 20), allocates the capacity, and returns routing instructions in terms of a POTS or ONNET translation number through the SCP pair 105. Each bridge server 101 would have a unique POTS or ONNET translation number for every simultaneous conference allowed on the bridge.), said destination address corresponding to said additional endpoint (col. 8, line 14-55; for example, if the on-demand service had a maximum participant capacity of 20, each bridge server would need at least 12 (240 ports/20 participants per conference) unique POTS or ONNET translation numbers).

establishing a point-to-point call (Examiner notes that this claim limitation interpreted to be the same as being "a connection") from said multiple control unit to said additional endpoint based on said destination address thereby bringing said additional endpoint into said audio

Art Unit: 2416

conference (col. 8, lines 14-55; the CACS 103 would note which translation number is currently "assigned" to which N00 number (unique number dialed by participant) so that a translation number can be tied to the dialed N00 number which can be tied to a participant which can be tied to the currently authorized participant/subscriber passcode. The SCP pair 105 encapsulates the routing instructions with an SS7 TCAP message and returns appropriate routing instructions via the SS7 network 106 to the originating service point 402. The on-demand call is routed via the PSTN 102 to the selected bridge server 101.).

As to claim 3, Detampel shows that the step of placing a call, links said endpoint (figure 1, user in network 106, 102; Figure 4, user 401-n) Figure 2 to said packet-switched conferencing system component (Figures 1, 4, CACS 103) through said packet-switched audio conferencing system (Figures 1, 4, 6; col. 8, lines 14-55).

As to claim 12, Detampel further shows the step of dynamically routing an operator voice path to service (Examiner interprets this claim limitation as being the same as having an operator being able to service/handle components/servers in a packet switched network; col. 6, lines 58-62, shows the Operator Interface module 305 is the application program interface to the operator/maintenance stations 107, and handles operator request queue management, registration for operator-monitored bridge events, and operator updates to the subscriber database 104; Figure 6, col. 10, lines 14-67; shows the operator functions when an invalid passcode/PIN was supplied, however, for example purposes, the operator station is shown to interact with bridge 101.; col. 4, lines 65-67; shows operator/maintenance stations 107 is connected to CACS through network 109 to provide operator interaction with system 10, that further includes multiple bridge servers 101a-n) multiple control units (Figure 1, bridge servers 101a-n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. **Claims 4-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel) in view of Thomas (US 6,421,339 B1; hereinafter Thomas).

As to claim 4, Detampel shows all of the elements except a location found signal indicating the selected multiple control unit.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Thomas. Specifically, Thomas shows a location found signal indicating the selected multiple control unit (Figure 3, col. 5, lines 25-30; gatekeeper GK 14 may screen or otherwise filter the data received in the LCF message from GK 44 and then send a LCF to the

Art Unit: 2416

requester or calling endpoint. As will be obvious to network designers, the data returned to the calling party may be limited so that calls must be routed through the home gatekeeper rather than giving the calling endpoint enough data to place a call directly to a roaming user).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Thomas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Thomas, in order to allow the gatekeeper to monitor the contents of all call received by given users (col. 5, lines 32-33).

As to claim 5, Detampel shows all of the elements except a location request signal.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Thomas. Specifically, Thomas shows a location request signal (Figure 3, LRQ).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Thomas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Thomas, in order to allow the gatekeeper to monitor the contents of all call received by given users (col. 5, lines 32-33).

7. **Claims 8-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel) in view of Jurkevics et al. (US 5,978,463; hereinafter Jurkevics).

As to claim 8, Detampel shows all of the elements except supporting full service audio conferencing using a reservation system and a call agent.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Jurkevics. Specifically, Jurkevics shows full service audio conferencing (Figures

Art Unit: 2416

2-4; abstract, audio conferencing system) using a reservation system (Figure 4, Autoscheduler 28) and a call agent (Figure 1, client 10, Figure 4, Client program 20 running on Client 10).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Jurkevics, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Jurkevics, in order to provide a substantially less labor intensive approach in audio conference scheduling (col. 3, lines 16-20).

As to claim 9, modified Detampel shows that the reservation system and the call agent are tightly integrated (Jurkevics: Figure 4-5, shows the integration of the automatic scheduling system with the client program in scheduling a conference; col. 5, lines 33-48; shows different levels of service, unattended service (no agent attending the audio conference), standard level, and premiere level).

As to claim 10, modified Detampel shows that the reservation system and the call agent are loosely integrated (Jurkevics: Figure 4-5, shows the integration of the automatic scheduling system with the client program in scheduling a conference; col. 5, lines 33-48; shows different levels of service, unattended service (no agent attending the audio conference), standard level, and premiere level).

8. **Claims 13-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel) in view of Semaan (US 5,680,392; hereinafter Semaan).

Art Unit: 2416

As to claim 13, Detampel shows all of the elements except the step of renegotiating the destination of a voice path to move an audio conference participant from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Semaan. Specifically, Semaan shows the step of renegotiating the destination of a voice path to move an audio conference participant from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit (Figure 2, 5; col. 11, lines 18-25; shows that if a user should wish to establish a conference with conferees who would be handled by the reservation controller of another domain, the bridge controller would pass the reservation request information onto the reservation request channel of the other reservation domain so that the appropriate reservation controller in the other domain could address the request; Figure 2 and 5, shows that each reservation controller is related to an MCU).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Semaan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Semaan, in order to provide the possibility of allowing different MCUs and reservation controllers (of different companies), to interact with each other and share information regarding requests for reservations (col. 5, lines 29-37).

As to claim 14, Detampel shows all of the elements except the step of moving said audio conference from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Semaan. Specifically, Semaan shows the step of moving said audio conference

Art Unit: 2416

(Figure 2, 5; col. 11, lines 18-25; shows that if a user should wish to establish a conference with conferees who would be handled by the reservation controller of another domain, the bridge controller would pass the reservation request information onto the reservation request channel of the other reservation domain so that the appropriate reservation controller in the other domain could address the request; Figure 2 and 5, shows that each reservation controller is related to an MCU) from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit (Examiner notes that there is a change in reservation controllers, there is also a change in MCUs).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Semaan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Semaan, in order to provide the possibility of allowing different MCUs and reservation controllers (of different companies), to interact with each other and share information regarding requests for reservations (col. 5, lines 29-37).

9. **Claim 15** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel) in view of Semaan (US 5,680,392; hereinafter Semaan) in further view of Rosenberg et al. (US 2005/0165894 A1; hereinafter Rosenberg).

As to claim 15, Detampel shows selected multiple control unit (Figure 1, bridge server 101a-n). However, Detampel does not explicitly show the steps of providing said audio conference to a streaming protocol server from said selected multiple control unit; connecting a passive participant to said streaming protocol server; and broadcasting said audio conference from said streaming protocol server to a said passive participant.

Art Unit: 2416

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Semaan. Specifically, Semaan shows the steps of providing said audio conference to a reservation controller from said selected multiple control unit (Figure 2, 5; col. 11, lines 18-25; shows that if a user should wish to establish a conference with conferees who would be handled by the reservation controller of another domain, the bridge controller would pass the reservation request information onto the reservation request channel of the other reservation domain so that the appropriate reservation controller in the other domain could address the request; Figure 2 and 5, shows that each reservation controller is related to an MCU);

connecting a passive participant to said reservation controller (col. 11, lines 18-25; col. 5, lines 20-29; if users 112c, 112e, 112f, 112g, 112h, and 112j should wish to participate in a multimedia conference, the services of the four different MCUs 126a-126d will be required. Thus, the two reservation controllers 130a, 130b must be contacted to reserve appropriate access and processing of the MCUs.); and

broadcasting said audio conference from said reservation controller to a said passive participant (col. 8, line 65 to col. 9, line 9; shows that the conference mode includes broadcast monologue and broadcast dialogue).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Semaan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Semaan, in order to provide the possibility of allowing different MCUs and reservation controllers (of different companies), to interact with each other and share information regarding requests for reservations (col. 5, lines 29-37).

Even though modified Detampel shows that the conference is held by the respective reservation controller (along with proper MCU), however, modified Detampel does not explicitly show that the conference is being provided to a streaming protocol server.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Rosenberg. Specifically, Rosenberg shows a streaming protocol server (Par. 0168; a conference participant can invite a SIP-speaking RTSP server into an existing conference, so as to appear as just another conference participant. Alternatively, for multicast conferences, an RTSP server can simply be given the same session description as was used for invitations).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Rosenberg, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Rosenberg, in order to provide one or more relatively advanced telephony services (Par. 0015).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2416

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REDENTOR M. PASIA whose telephone number is (571)272-9745. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00am to 3:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Aung Moe can be reached on (571)272-7314. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aung S. Moe/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416

/Redentor M Pasia/
Examiner, Art Unit 2416